

Joint Sub SENATE TAX	committee	on Revenue
Exhibit No.	12 2014	
DateBill No.	-12-2015	
Dill No.	www.leg.mt.	gov/css/fiscal

Joint Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates: Day 4
Insurance Tax, Consumption Taxes, and Other Sources--Comparison & Comment Sheet

		Insurance	ax, Consum	nption Taxes		SourcesComparison & Comment Sheet
					(\$ Millions	
			January	January	January	
Revenue Source	pr.	HJ 2	Executive	LFD	Total \$ Diff.	Comments
Beer Tax						
	2015	3.1	3.0	3.1		
	2016	3.2	3.0	3.2		
	2017	3.2	3.1	3.2	(0.4)	
Cigarette Tax						
	2015	30.4	30.2	30.7		
	2016	30.9	30.6	31.4		
	2017	30.2	30.2	30.7	(1.8)	
Liquor Excise Tax					100	
	2015	19.1	19.3	19.0		
	2016	19.7	20.1	19.6		
	2017	20.4	20.5	20.5	0.8	
Liquor Profits						
	2015	10.7	10.8	10.7		
	2016	11.2	11.0	11.1		
	2017	11.6	11.2	11.6	(0.5)	
Lottery Profits	and parties a		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
	2015	12.6	12.6	12.3		
	2016	13.4	11.6	12.9		
	2017	14.4	10.7	14.2	(4.4)	
Tobacco Tax						
	2015	6.2	6.2	6.2		
	2016	6.4	6.4	6.4		
	2017	6.6	6.6	6.6	(0.1)	
Video Gaming Tax						
	2015	60.4	59.9	60.2		
	2016	62.7	62.1	62.5		
	2017	66.0	64.3	65.7	(2.2)	
Wine Tax						
	2015	2.3	2.3	2.3		
	2016	2.4	2.4	2.4		
	2017	2.4	2.5	2.4	0.0	



Joint Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates: Day 4
Insurance Tax, Consumption Taxes, and Other Sources--Comparison & Comment Sheet

					(\$ Millions	)
			January	January	January	
Revenue Source		HJ 2	Executive	LFD	Total \$ Diff.	Comments
Insurance Tax						
	2015	\$63.9	\$66.3	\$64.4		
	2016	65.4	68.1	66.4		
	2017	66.1	70.9	67.1	\$7.3	
All Other Revenue						
	2015	39.5	36.3	39.5		
	2016	36.4	40.5	36.5		
	2017	36.7	37.2	36.8	1.1	
Highway Patrol Fine	S					
	2015	4.2	4.4	4.2		
	2016	4.3	4.6	4.3		
	2017	4.3	5.0	4.3	1.2	
Nursing Facilities Fe	ee			21 - 22 × 1	1.5	
	2015	4.9	4.8	4.9		
	2016	4.8	4.7	4.8		
	2017	4.7	4.6	4.7	(0.3)	27
Public Institution Re	eimb.					
	2015	17.1	17.0	16.6		
	2016	17.2	17.3	16.9		
	2017	17.3	17.8	17.0	1.5	
Tobacco Settlement						
	2015	3.2	3.3	3.2		
	2016	3.1	3.2	3.1		
	2017	3.1	3.1	3.1	0.1	





						ue Estimates: Day 4
			Р	roperty rax		& Comment Sheet
					(\$ Millions	
			January	January	January	
Revenue Source		HJ 2	Executive	LFD	Total \$ Diff.	Comments
Property Tax						
	2015	\$249.8	\$247.9	\$249.8		
	2016	245.4	244.4	245.4		
	2017	255.3	253.2	255.3	(\$5.1)	

## BEER TAX: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates. The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the

	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.4)	\$9.5	\$9.1	\$9.5	Total
	1			(0.2)	3.2	3.1	3.2	2017
	1			(0.1)	3.2	3.0	3.2	2016
	\$0.0			(\$0.1)	\$3.1	\$3.0	\$3.1	2015
Comments	\$ Diff. C	LFD	Executive	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	HJ 2	FΥ
	Adjusted	Adjusted	Adjusted	January		January		
		lions)	(\$ Millions)					
	fferences	stimate Di	Beer Tax Revenue Estimate Differences	Beer Tax				

### MODEL COMPARISON

- OBPP models per capita consumption

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

the estimate difference is not recommended The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge



## CIGARETTE TAX: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates.

		\$ Diff. Comments					
)ifferences	Adjusted	\$ Diff.	\$0.0		1	\$0.0	
Estimate l	Adjusted	LFD				\$0.0	
IX Revenue Esti (\$ Millions)	Adjusted	Executive				\$0.0	
Cigarette Tax Revenue Estimate Differences (\$ Millions)	January Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	\$ Diff.	(\$0.5)	(0.7)	(0.5)	(\$1.8)	
0		LFD	\$30.7	31.4	30.7	\$92.8	
	January	Executive	\$30.2	30.6	30.2	\$91.1	
		HJ 2	4	30.9	30.2	\$91.5	
		FΥ	2015	2016	2017	Total	

### MODEL COMPARISON

- Differences are primarily due to modeling approaches
  - LFD models sales and effective tax rates
    - OBPP models per capita consumption

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge the estimate difference is not recommended.



## LIQUOR TAX: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the

	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.8	\$59.1	\$59.9	\$59.3	Total
	1			0.1	20.5	20.5	20.4	2017
				0.4	19.6	20.1	19.7	2016
	\$0.0			\$0.3	\$19.0	\$19.3	\$19.1	2015
Comments	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	HJ 2	FY
	Adjusted	Adjusted	Adjusted	January	January	January		
		lions)	(\$ Millions)					
ferences	stimate Diff	Revenue Es	Liquor Excise & License Tax Revenue Estimate Differences	xcise & Li	Liquor E			
	stimate Diff	Revenue Es	cense Tax F	xcise & Li	Liquor E			

### MODEL COMPARISON

- OBPP models per capita consumption

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

the estimate difference is not recommended. The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge

## LIQUOR PROFITS: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates.

6			\$ Diff. Comments					
Differences		Adjusted	\$ Diff.	\$0.0	1	4	\$0.0	
Estimate I	(8110)	Adjusted	LFD				\$0.0	
S Revenue Esti		Adjusted	Executive				\$0.0	
Liquor Profits Revenue Estimate Differences		January January Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	\$ Diff.	\$0.1	(0.1)	(0.4)	(\$0.5)	
		January	LFD	\$10.7	11.1	11.6	\$33.5	
		January	Executive	\$10.8	11.0	11.2	\$33.0	
			HJ 2	\$10.7	11.2	11.6	\$33.5	
			FΥ	2015	2016	2017	Total	

### MODEL COMPARISON

- Differences are primarily due to modeling approaches LFD models sales and effective tax rates
- OBPP models per capita consumption

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge the estimate difference is not recommended.

## LOTTERY PROFITS: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the

	(\$0.0)	\$37.9	\$37.9	(\$4.4)	\$39.4	\$35.0	\$40.4	Total
	(0.7)	13.7	13.0	(3.4)	14.2	10.7	14.4	2017
	0.6	11.9	12.5	(1.3)		11.6	13.4	2016
	\$0.1	\$12.3	\$12.4	\$0.3		\$12.6	\$12.6	2015
Comments	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	HJ 2	FY
	Adjusted	Adjusted	Adjusted		January	January		
		ions)	(\$ Millions)					
,	Differences	Estimate	Lottery Profits Revenue Estimate Differences	ottery Prof	_			

### MODEL COMPARISON

- Both offices have new estimates since the January update
- OBPP incorporated operating costs for the biennium as proposed by the lottery director
- LFD incorporated operating costs for the biennium as adopted by the Joint Appropriations Subcommittee on General Government
- There is no longer a real difference in the 3-year estimates

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

the estimate difference is not recommended The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge



## TOBACCO TAX: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates.

10			\$ Diff. Comments					
)ifferences		Adjusted	\$ Diff.	\$0.0	1	1	\$0.0	
Estimate [	OHS)	Adjusted	LFD				\$0.0	
Tobacco Tax Revenue Estimate Differences	(\$ IVIIIIOLIS)	January January Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	Executive				\$0.0	
obacco Ta		January	\$ Diff.	(\$0.1)	(0.0)	0.0	(\$0.1)	
		January	LFD	\$6.2	6.4	9.9	\$19.2	
		January	Executive	\$6.2	6.4	9.9	\$19.1	
			HJ 2		6.4	9.9	\$19.2	
			FY	2015	2016	2017	Total	

### MODEL COMPARISON

- Differences are primarily due to modeling approaches
  - LFD models sales and effective tax rates
    - OBPP models per capita consumption

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge the estimate difference is not recommended.

# VIDEO GAMING TAX: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates. The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the Joint

	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$2.2)	\$188.5	\$186.2	\$189.2	Total
				(1.5)	65.7	64.3	66.0	2017
	1			(0.4)	62.5	62.1	62.7	2016
	\$0.0			(\$0.3)	\$60.2	\$59.9	\$60.4	2015
Comments	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	\$ Diff.		Executive	HJ 2	FΥ
	Adjusted	Adjusted	Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	January	January	January		
		lions)	(\$ Millions)					
ces	te Differen	າue Estima	Video Gaming Tax Revenue Estimate Differences	eo Gamin	Vid			

### MODEL COMPARISON

- LFD models gambling revenues based on MT personal income OBPP models gambling revenues based on MT wage disbursements

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

the estimate difference is not recommended. The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge



## WINE TAX: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates.

-		1,11	_					111
			<b>\$ Diff.</b> Comments					
		_	Ö	0			0	
ferences		Adjusted	\$ Diff.	\$0.0	1	1	\$0.0	
stimate Dif	ions)	Adjusted	LFD				\$0.0	
Wine Tax Revenue Estimate Differences	(\$ Millions)	January January Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	Executive				\$0.0	
Wine Tax		January	\$ Diff.	(\$0.0)	0.0	0.0	\$0.0	
		January	LFD	\$2.3	2.4	2.4	\$7.1	
		January	Executive	\$2.3	2.4	2.5	\$7.1	
			HJ 2	\$2.3	2.4	2.4	\$7.1	
			FΥ	2015	2016	2017	Total	

### MODEL COMPARISON

- Differences are primarily due to modeling approaches 

  LFD models sales and effective tax rates
  - - OBPP models per capita consumption

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge the estimate difference is not recommended.



## INSURANCE TAX: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the

								- ,
	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7.3	\$198.0	\$205.3	\$195.4	Total
				3.7	67.1	70.9	66.1	2017
				1.7	66.4	68.1	65.4	2016
	\$0.0			\$1.8	\$64.4	\$66.3	\$63.9	2015
Comments	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	HJ 2	FY
	Adjusted	Adjusted	Adjusted Adjusted	January	January	January		
		lions)	(\$ Millions)					
	Differences	Estimate	Insurance Tax Revenue Estimate Differences	nsurance T	_			

### MODEL COMPARISON

- executive's year-to-date update to the FY 2015 numbers Model approaches are different; however, the driver of the difference between the estimates is the
- different methodology than that employed by the executive: LFD is open to incorporating a year-to-date, annualized number for FY 2015, but would suggest a
- of a simple average, this approach leads to a lower than normal collection rate, and higher abnormal collection patterns. Due to the equal weight afforded to those years in calculation January. year-end annualization. The number assumed by the executive is based on an average collection rate through This average uses FY 2002-2014 which incorporates two years of data with
- 0 two lowest, two highest values) which would bring the January rate more in line with norma LFD would suggest using either the median collection rate, or an Olympic average (dropping historic collection patterns

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Given direction from the subcommittee, LFD is comfortable inputting a year-to-date annualized number for FY 2015 but would suggest an approach other than a simple average

# ALL OTHER REVENUE: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates.

			\$ Diff. Comments					
erences		Adjusted	\$ Diff.	\$0.0	1	1	\$0.0	
stimate Diff	ons)	Adjusted	LFD				\$0.0	
All Other Revenue Estimate Differences	(\$ Millions)	January January Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	Executive				\$0.0	
All Other F		January	\$ Diff.	(\$3.2)	4.0	0.3	\$1.1	
		January	LFD	\$39.5	36.5	36.8	\$112.8	
		January	Executive	\$36.3	40.5	37.2	\$114.0	
			HJ 2	\$39.5	36.4	36.7	\$112.6	
			FY	2015	2016	2017	Total	

### MODEL COMPARISON

Both LFD and OBPP estimate the numerous sources contained here independently, assuming revenues would be similar per source to the most recently completed fiscal year. Remaining sources are estimated by speaking to the respective agencies that collect the tax

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge the estimate difference is not recommended.



# HIGHWAY PATROL FINES: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates. executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the

	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1.2	\$12.7	\$14.0	\$12.7	Total
	1			0.7	4.3	5.0	4.3	2017
	ı			0.4	4.3	4.6	4.3	2016
	\$0.0			\$0.1	\$4.2	\$4.4	\$4.2	2015
Comments	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	HJ 2	FΥ
	Adjusted	Adjusted	Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	y January A	January	January		
		lions)	(\$ Millions)					
ices	ate Differen	nue Estima	Highway Patrol Fines Revenue Estimate Differences	way Patrol	High			

### MODEL COMPARISON

- LFD uses a time series model to forecast highway patrol fines
- OBPP uses early season gas prices to forecast highway patrol fines

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge the estimate difference is not recommended.

# NURSING FACILITIES FEE: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates.

ses			omments					
Nursing Facilities Fees Revenue Estimate Differences		Adjusted	\$ Diff. Comments	\$0.0	1	ı.	\$0.0	
enue Estim	ons)	Adjusted	LFD				\$0.0	
Fees Rev	(\$ Millions)	January January Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	Executive				\$0.0	
ng Facilities		January	\$ Diff.	(\$0.1)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(\$0.3)	
Nursir		January	LFD	\$4.9	4.8	4.7	\$14.3	
		January	Executive	\$4.8	4.7	4.6	\$14.0	
			HJ 2	0	4.8	4.7	\$14.3	
			FΥ	2015	2016	2017	Total	

### MODEL COMPARISON

- LFD models bed days over time using a simple linear regression
- The OBPP model assumes the average taxable bed decline for the past four years continues

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge the estimate difference is not recommended.



#### **ADJUSTMENTS** PUBLIC INSTITUTION REIMBURSEMENT: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES Qo

The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates.

	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1.5	\$50.6	\$52.1	\$51.6	Total
				0.8	17.0	17.8	17.3	2017
	1			0.4	16.9	17.3	17.2	2016
	\$0.0			\$0.3	\$16.6	\$17.0	\$17.1	2015
Comments	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	HJ 2	FΥ
	Adjusted	Adjusted	Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	January	January	January		
		lions)	(\$ Millions)					
Differences	Estimate	s Revenue	Public Institution Reimbursements Revenue Estimate Differences	tution Rein	Public Instit			* **

### MODEL COMPARISON

facilities Differences are due in large part to differing assumptions of average daily population in the five

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

the estimate difference is not recommended The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge

### COMMENTS, CONCERNS OR SUGGESTIONS

# TOBACCO SETTLEMENT: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since the initial presentation to the Joint Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates.

es		Somments				
te Differenc	Adjusted	\$ Diff. Comments	\$0.0	1	1	\$0.0
nue Estima' ons)	Adjusted	LFD				\$0.0
Tobacco Settlement Revenue Estimate Differences (\$ Millions)	January January Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	Executive LFD				\$0.0
acco Settlei	January	\$ Diff.	\$0.1	0.1	(0.0)	\$0.1
Toba	January	LFD	\$3.2	3.1	3.1	\$9.4
	January	Executive	\$3.3	3.2	3.1	\$9.6
		HJ2		3.1	3.1	\$9.4
		F	2015	2016	2017	Total

### MODEL COMPARISON

- It is difficult to model tobacco settlement revenue precisely as the contested payment amounts vary from year to year, and occasionally (FY 2014 was the first time), contested payments may come out of litigation and add to the annual revenue
  - LFD and OBPP have slightly different modeling methodologies for this source, but due to the nearness of the estimate and time constraints these differences were not fully explored

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The three-year difference is less than \$3.0 million; given current time constraints, further analysis to bridge the estimate difference is not recommended.

## PROPERTY TAX: SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES & ADJUSTMENTS

Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates executive and LFD, and the adjustments, if applicable, made since The table below shows the estimate contained in HJ 2, the January estimate updates provided by the the initial presentation to the Joint

	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$5.1)	\$750.5	\$750.5 \$745.4	\$750.5	Total
				(2.1)	255.3	253.2	255.3	2017
				(1.0)	245.4	244.4	245.4	2016
	\$0.0			(\$2.0)	\$249.8	\$247.9	\$249.8	2015
Comments	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	\$ Diff.	LFD	Executive	HJ 2	FΥ
	Adjusted	Adjusted	Adjusted Adjusted Adjusted	January	January	January		
		lions)	(\$ Millions)					
	Differences	Estimate [	Property Tax Revenue Estimate Differences	Property To				

### MODEL COMPARISON

- The property models are very similar: LFD grows property classes off of taxable value; OBPP grows property classes off of market value. This is one of the reasons this estimate is very close
- of this, it appears as though there may have been an issue with the FY 2014 number, and correcting for this brought the estimates much closer One of the bigger differences in the estimates has to do with coal gross proceeds. Upon discussion
- models, but that will likely cause very similar, and slight, effects in both models There is some new data, such as new protested property data, that will be incorporated into the